

14 / 11 Corridor Study
Technical Committee Workshop November 29, 2007
SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP OUTCOMES



* Corresponds to route alternative numbers on attached summary maps

** "T" indicates Technical Committee. First number indicates small group number. Second number indicates small group alternative number.

"T.1.1" indicates first option generated by at Technical Committee workshop by Small Group number 1.

Example:

GROUP 1

Map Code*	Small Group Code(s)**	Description	Participant Comments	Participant Ratings					
				Hate It	Don't Like It	Neutral	Like it	Love it	Like or Love It
1	T.1.1	US 14 to CTH H to Intersection of WIS 11/Willowdale Road	Large impact on existing homes, driveway. Promotes premature development outside of existing Janesville urban area	7% (1)	29% (4)	29% (4)	29% (4)	7 % (1)	36% (1)
2	T.1.2	Existing Burdick Road to CTH A, new route to southbound WIS 11(aligned with Hayner Road)	Provides direct access with fewer impacts than some alternatives though still some for homes, farms, and environment	0%	23% (3)	15% (2)	39% (5)	23% (3)	52% (8)
3	T.1.3	New Route from US 14 to Little Road to new WIS 11 intersection west of Pahl Road	None	0%	7% (1)	29% (4)	64% (9)	0%	64% (9)
4	T.1.4	New Route from US 14 east of Burdick Road to southbound WIS 11(aligned with Hayner Road	Direct route will little impact on existing homes and access, but more environmental impacts	0%	29% (4)	7% (1)	43% (6)	21% (3)	64 % (9)
5	T.1.5	Existing Burdick Road to CTH A, new route south to Pahl Road with new intersection at WIS 11	None	0%	21% (3)	29% (4)	43% (6)	7% (1)	50% (1)
6	T.1.6	Redesignate US 14 under local jurisdiction and Combine 14/11	None	20% (1)	0%	40% (2)	20% (1)	20% (1)	40% (2)

14 / 11 Corridor Study
Technical Committee Workshop November 29, 2007
SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP OUTCOMES



* Corresponds to route alternative numbers on attached summary maps

** "T" indicates Technical Committee. First number indicates small group number. Second number indicates small group alternative number.

"T.1.1" indicates first option generated by at Technical Committee workshop by Small Group number 1.

Example:

GROUP 2

Map Code*	Small Group Code(s)**	Description	Participant Comments	Participant Ratings					
				Hate It	Don't Like It	Neutral	Like it	Love it	Like or Love It
1	T.2.1	"DO NOTHING"	None	36% (4)	27% (3)	27% (3)	0%	10% (1)	10% (1)
2	T.2.2	New Route from US 14 due south in alignment with S. Hayner Road	Serves local as well as bypass traffic, little impact on existing homes, , close to city, short route, but with significant environmental	0%	21% (3)	21% (3)	29% (4)	29% (4)	58% (8)
3	T.2.3	New Route from US 14 east of Britt Road to Little Road to new Intersecton with WIS 11.	Leaves room to deal with railroad intersections, limits but does not eliminate impacts on homes, driveways; signficiant enviromental	0%	15% (2)	15% (2)	70% (9)	0%	70% (9)
4	T.2.4	New Route from US 14 following ATC line to WIS 11	Avoids homes, driveways and provides direct route; but creates problem at railroad intersection, divides farm land and crosses env. corridor	0%	21% (3)	36% (5)	43% (6)	0%	43% (6)
5	T.2.5	Existing CTH H to WIS 11 (with variants that use either existing WIS 11 eastward or W Rockport Road eastward to southbound WIS 11	Avoids steep topography, existing subdivisons to east, but is very close to railroad, has large impact on CTH homes and driveways, and may promote sprawl without land use controls	15% (2)	8% (1)	54% (7)	15% (2)	8% (1)	23% (3)
6	T.2.6	Existing CTH H directly south with new route south then east to W. Oleary Road to WIS 11	Close to Rail Road crossing; impacts on existing driveways, structures; furtherest from Janesville Urban Service area.	21% (3)	43% (6)	29% (4)	7% (1)	0%	7% (1)
7	T.2.7	New Route from US 14 following ATC line south of Rockport Road, then due east to WIS 11 just north of West Hanover Road	Close to Rail Road crossing; few impacts on existing driveways, fairly far from Janesville Urban Service area.	17% (2)	17% (2)	25% (3)	33% (4)	8% (1)	41% (5)
8	T.2.8	New Route from intersection of CTH H/US 14 southeast to southbound WIS 11(aligned with South Hayner Road)	Close to rail road crossing, large impact on rural subdivisions, environmnet, farm land, crossings of exisging roads	17% (2)	50% (6)	33% (4)	0%	0%	0%
9	T.2.9	Mostly existing routes: US 14 to North Polzin Road to CTH A to new route south to southbound WIS 11 (aligned with S.Hayner Road)	None	10% (1)	50% (5)	30% (3)	10% (1)	0%	10% (1)

14 / 11 Corridor Study
Technical Committee Workshop November 29, 2007
SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP OUTCOMES



* Corresponds to route alternative numbers on attached summary maps

** "T" indicates Technical Committee. First number indicates small group number. Second number indicates small group alternative number.

"T.1.1" indicates first option generated by at Technical Committee workshop by Small Group number 1.

Example:

GROUP 3

Map Code*	Small Group Code(s)**	Description	Participant Comments	Participant Ratings					
				Hate It	Don't Like It	Neutral	Like it	Love it	Like or Love It
1	T.3.1	New Route from US 14 east of Burdick Road to southbound WIS 11(aligned with S. Hayner Road)	most direct route, could act as bypass for US 51, least impact on existing homes, significant impacts on environmental and farm lands	0%	29% (4)	7% (1)	35% (5)	29% (4)	64% (9)
2	T.3.2	Existing N. Burdick Road to CTHA, then new route to southbound WIS 11(aligned with Hayner Road)	Impacts on existing homes and driveways, local traffic, and possible US 51 bypass; potenial arch sites	0%	21% (3)	21% (3)	43% (6)	15% (2)	58% (8)
3	T.3.3	Use Existing CTH H to CTH A, then new route from Burdick Road to southbound WIS 11 (aligned with South Hayner Road)	Impacts on existing homes and driveways on CTH H, A; less impact on farmland, less benefit to local traffic, inefficient as US 51 Bypass	7% (1)	29% (4)	57% (8)	7% (1)	0%	7% (1)
4	T.3.4	Existing CTH H to eastbound WIS 11	Impacts on existing driveways, structures, access, traffic	14% (2)	14% (2)	50% (7)	14% (2)	8% (1)	22% (3)
5	T.3.5	New Route from US 14 following ATC line to eastbound WIS 11	Fewer driveway, structural impacts; more farm impacts; too far west to serve local traffic	0%	36% (5)	14% (2)	43% (6)	7% (1)	50% (7)
6	T.3.6	New Route from US 14 east of Polzin Road (in alignment with Willowdale Road) to eastbound WIS 11	Fewer impacts on driveways and structures; close to residential subdivisions; large impact on farming and farm parcels; significant environmental crossings	9% (1)	18% (2)	18% (2)	55% (6)	0%	55% (6)



Summary of Workshop Outcomes
Western Corridor Options
Technical Committee Workshop – November 29, 2007

To: Technical and Advisory Committees of the US 14/WIS 11 Corridor Study
From: Dan Moser, Planning Consultant, Vandewalle & Associates
Re: **Outcomes from the Technical Committee Workshop: November 29, 2007**

The project team held a meeting of the Technical Committee for US 14/WIS 11 Corridor Study on November 29, 2007. The purpose of the meeting was to provide updates on the results of the US 14/11 Corridor Study to date and solicit input from the Technical Committee for preferred alternatives for the portion of the proposed segment of the corridor west of Janesville and Interstate 39/90. As part of this meeting, we facilitated a workshop in which Technical Committee attendees met in three small groups to discuss issues related to the western corridor area including land use and other impacts. Committee members were also asked to generate ideas for improved connections between US Highway 14 and WIS Highway 11 west of Janesville to relieve traffic pressures on the existing US 14 north of Janesville. After alternative alignment options had been generated, committee members were asked to rate each alternative on a scale of 1 to 5 (with a 1 rating indicting the rater “hated” the alternative and a rating of 5 indicating that the participant “loved it”).

The resulting potential US 14/WIS 11 alternatives generated by the Technical Committee attendees are summarized on the attached maps and tables. For each group, alternatives were mapped and the corresponding table shows the individual comments and ratings provided by workshop attendees. Owing to the number of alternatives generated, the results from each group were mapped and tabulated separately for clarity. Nevertheless, some of the alternatives generated by the three groups were similar or nearly identical.

The remainder of this memo provides a more general summary and analysis of the workshop outcomes.

- ◆ In general, new alignments (routes that would require acquisition of new right-of-way) were viewed more favorably than options for corridors that made extensive use of existing right-of-way. The workshop participants indicated concern over the costs and disruptions associated with improving existing rights-of-way such as the need to eliminate and provide alternatives for existing driveways, the need to acquire and/or demolish structures in or near the proposed corridor, and the potential impact on property values and enjoyment of remaining houses. While attendees recognized that new routes may require more undeveloped lands than use of existing rights-of-way, split some farms, and require crossing of environmentally sensitive areas, these concerns were (generally) given less weight than the costs associated with extensive use of existing routes that were designed as local roads with multiple driveways.
- ◆ In general, participants seemed to favor diverting traffic from US 14 to WIS 11 at a point further east (i.e. closer to existing Janesville development). Several reasons were given for this, including the desire to keep development focus closer to the existing and planned Janesville urban service area, better serve local traffic, better serve the additional function of a US Highway 51 around



Summary of Workshop Outcomes
Western Corridor Options
Technical Committee Workshop – November 29, 2007

the west side of Janesville, reduce impact on existing viable farms and residential subdivisions further to the west, and preventing premature development further to the west.

- ◆ In general, more direct alignments were preferred to those that created multiple or difficult intersections and turning movements.
- ◆ The alternatives receiving the most favorable ratings were generally those that created new (or partially new) north-south alignments somewhere east of Britt Road. These alignments fall into three subgroups:
 - New alignments somewhere east of Burdick Road, generally aligning with southbound WIS 11 (Alternatives T.1.4, T.2.2, and T.3.1 in the attached charts maps). These options received the most “love it” ratings by a wide margin.
 - New alignments between Burdick Road and Britt Road, generally aligning with Little Road (Alternatives T.2.3 and T.1.2). Alternative T.2.3 received the highest overall favorable rating of any alternative (70% “liked it”).
 - Alignments that utilize Burdick Road and new alignments between Burdick Road and southbound WIS 11 near S. Hayner Rd. (Alternatives T.1.2, T.1.5, and T.3.2). These options scored well in spite of the impacts on existing residences and driveways on Burdick Road, but generally were not quite as popular as the “all new alignment” alternatives above.

While these routes would impact environmental features, they were judged to have the fewest major and long-term impacts on farming, farmland, and residences further to the west. They would also be noted for providing the additional potential benefits of serving local traffic and doubling as a US Highway 51 bypass west of Janesville, as well as promoting relatively compact urban development west of Janesville and providing a sufficiently direct route for east/west traffic past Janesville.

- ◆ Alternative Alignments west of Britt Road generally fared less well. The highest rated alternatives in this category generally followed a new alignment utilizing the ATC easements east of CTH H (Alternatives T.2.4 and T.3.5) as far south as east bound WIS 11. Alternatives that utilized existing rights-of-way such as CTH H, CTH A, and Polzin Road generally fared poorly, as did alternatives that required new rights-of-way south of eastbound WIS 11 or between Polzin and Britt Roads. These were generally judged to have too great of impact on existing residences, driveways, farms, and environmental features. They also generally were judged not to serve local traffic and to preclude use as a US 51 bypass.
- ◆ Two alternatives were not mapped. Alternative T.2.1 (the “Do Nothing” alternative) was formally rated by the group but was overwhelmingly disliked. Alternative T.1.6 called for redesignating US 14 and turning the existing US 14 segment north of Janesville over to local jurisdiction received a mixed response.